

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
 Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
 Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1 stands rejected 5 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196 to Reiche (hereinafter, Reiche) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,904 to Rode (hereinafter, Rode). Applicants thank the Examiner for the clarification of the rejection. However, Applicants continue to respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of Claim 1.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the MPEP directs:

**ESTABLISHING A *PRIMA FACIE* CASE OF OBVIOUSNESS**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

MPEP, § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 5, p. 2100-125 (August 2006). This section of the MPEP makes it clear that to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection, there must be a proper suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings.

In the prior response, Applicants stated in part:

The Office Action further stated:

Reiche does not explicitly indicate that the user ID is a randomized user ID.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
 HODGSON, LLP.  
 2000 Golden Road, Suite 220  
 Montrose, CA 93350  
 (707) 655-0888  
 Fax (707) 655-0888

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
 Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
 Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

#### **AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

Rode teaches a system for controlling access to system resources (Abstract) that includes a unique identifier for the user as taught in Reiche, but further teaches that the identifier can be a uniformly chosen random number (Column 2, lines 45-54).

The motivation for this modification was given as "to allow an identifier to be chosen without contain [Sic] any personal information about the user, allowing the system to keep the user anonymous. However, with respect to the client ID, Reiche, as quoted above, taught "Authentication Daemon 124 will generate a unique 4 byte client ID." Accordingly, the client ID of Reiche does not contain any personal information about the user and so Reiche provided the very feature cited as the motivation for modifying Reiche. Again, when Reiche is considered as a whole Reiche teaches that the motivation for the combination of references is not well founded.

These remarks were not addressed in the Final Rejection, and the identical motivation was stated. Thus, these facts stand admitted, and the motivation is not well founded.

Nevertheless, Applicants will address the additional remarks in the final office action in further detail. Again, Claim 1 recites in part:

receiving a resource request, said resource request including a rights key credential,

Thus, a single element, a resource request, is received and that element includes a rights key credential. The rights key credential in turn includes:

said rights key credential comprising:  
 at least one key . . .; and  
 a resource identifier,

Claim 1 expressly recites that the at least one key and a resource identifier are part of the rights key credential. Claim 1 does not recited just any resource identifier, but rather a specific identifier:

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
 HODGSON, LLP.  
 One hundred West Office Plaza  
 1500 Gardner Street, Suite 220  
 Monterey, CA 93940  
 (831) 655-0880  
 Fax: (831) 655-0888

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

said resource identifier comprising a resource server peer group ID and a randomized user ID

The explicit claim language in Claim 1 has recast in the rejection and reduced to a gist, e.g.,

. . . Reiche teaches an authentication system that allows a client to make a request to a server using a URL(Column 8, lines 47-49) this is a uniform resource location, meaning a request for a identified resource. As part of this URL request is the address of an authentication program on the customer server(Column 8, lines 47 -51; Column 9, lines 57 -63) since this is a URL request, as part of any URL is the server domain as see [Sic] in Figure 46A where the Some Resource Server Peer Group, for examiner in www.uspto.gov, uspto.gov would be considered the resource server peer group ID as defined in the specification of the instant application which has to be present in all URL requests. . . . So all the limitations of the intention [Sic] are covered by the reference Reiche.

As noted above, Claim 1 explicitly stated that the resource identifier included "a resource server peer group ID and a randomized user ID." There has been no citation or explanation of any motivation to modify the standard URL used as the basis of the rejection to include this specific resource identifier. Further, Reiche expressly differentiates between a client ID and a user ID. The Examiner's attention is called to Col. 11, line 66 to Col. 12, line 24 where Reiche explicitly described what is included in the various URLs. None include the user ID described by Reiche. Thus, Reiche cannot provide any motivation for modifying the standard URL used as the basis for the rejection to read on the resource identifier recited in Claim 1 that includes a randomized user ID. Accordingly, these are still further reasons why the obviousness rejection is not well founded.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP.  
Garden Way Office Place  
1100 Garden Road, Suite 220  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 655-0880  
Fax (831) 655-0558

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

Next, the rejection mixes and matches the teachings of Reiche and so fails to consider the reference as a whole as required by the MPEP. Reiche teaches that different URLs are generated in different parts of the authentication process and transmitted with redirection commands. The request at Column 8, lines 47 -51 is the initial request to "a secure customer HTTP server." At Col. 9, lines 8 to 11, a modified request is sent via redirection "to the client browser." At Col. 9, lines 38 to 42 yet another request is submitted by the client browser to an authentication server that is different from the customer server. At Col. 9, lines 51 to 56 still yet another modification of the URL is sent by the authentication server to the client browser with a redirection command.

The rejection, as quoted above, lumps the multiple requests to different entities together and so apparently fails to recognize that receipt of multiple different requests has occurred prior to the description at Col. 9, lines 57 to 63. The use of multiple requests from Reiche in the rejection demonstrates that Reiche teaches away from the receiving operation recited in Claim 1. The rejection has provided no rationale for picking and choosing elements from among the various requests to different entities described by Reiche. Further, as noted in the prior response and incorporated herein by reference, the rejection fails to treat the elements of Reiche consistently.

As noted above, Reiche at Col. 11, line 66 to Col. 12, line 25 explicitly described what is included in the various URLs. None of the URLs or the cookie include the user ID described by Reiche. Accordingly, Reiche explicitly teaches away from the interpretation provided in the rejection. Also, the rejection has provided no rationale for modifying the explicit structures defined by Reiche to read on the rights key credential of Claim 1 as explicitly defined in the claim.

Next, the rationale for continuing the rejection stated:

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
 Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
 Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

### AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

. . . Further, Reiche teaches using a encrypted simple private key to authenticate a user (Column 9, lines 1-6) which is passed in the HTTP header (Column 9, lines 53-56), which is also how the rights key credential is used in the instant application . . .

This further mischaracterizes both the language of Claim 1 as quoted above and Reiche. Col. 9, lines 1 to 6 stated:

At step 212, a special URL is constructed from the row ID, client ID, transaction ID and a checksum of these three values. This information is then encrypted using a simple private key encryption algorithm, uuencoded and URL encoded to facilitate transmission (step 214).

The row ID, client ID transaction ID and a checksum are encrypted by the authentication daemon 124 of Reiche using a private key encryption algorithm. This portion of Reiche does not say the private key is passed in the HTTP header. It is the "information," i.e., the "the row ID, client ID, transaction ID and a checksum," which is encrypted, uuencoded and URL encoded to facilitate transmission.

Column 9, lines 49 to 56 of Reiche stated:

At step 234, another special URL containing the AD authentication table row ID, client ID, transaction ID and checksum of these three values is constructed. The AD CGI program 114 then issues (step 236), to the client browser, a 302 redirect to the AD 124 on the customer server 120 passing, in the HTTP header, the special URL as a parameter. The special URL points, in fact, to the AD 124, passing as a parameter of the transaction ID data. (Underline emphasis shows portion extracted and used in above quoted portion of rejection.) (Bold for emphasis)

The special URL is what is passed in the HTTP header, and so yet again, it appears that the special URL is being equated to the key rights credential. This is but further evidence that Claim 1 has been reduced to a gist.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
 HODGSON, LLP.  
 General West Office Plaza  
 1900 Garcia Road, Suite 220  
 Monterey, CA 93940  
 (831) 655-0180  
 Fax (831) 655-0588

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

As quoted above, Claim 1 expressly recited that the resource request includes a rights key credential and then that the rights key credential includes at least one key and a resource identifier. Claim 1 then further defines the resource identifier.

The special URL of Reiche does not include a key as recited in Claim 1 or any user ID, but rather "another special URL containing the AD authentication table row ID, client ID, transaction ID and checksum of these three values is constructed." Reiche carefully distinguishes this special URL from the one described earlier and expressly stated that four items were included and those four items did not include any type of User ID. Further, the special URL is described as pointing to "AD 124." This conclusion is also supported by the express description of the URLs and cookie described by Reiche as previously noted.

The Office Action failed to provide any rationale on how this section of Reiche provides any teaching, suggestion, or disclosure of the at least one key to provide access to a resource on said data communications network, as recited in Claim 1, or including any type of user ID. Therefore, the Office Action failed to show how the cited references, alone or in combination, taught or suggested all of the claim limitations of Claim 1.

For each of the foregoing reasons, the prior art reference (or references when combined) failed to teach or suggest all the claim limitations; therefore, a *prima facie* obviousness rejection has not been made. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. With respect to Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the above comments are incorporated herein by reference. Each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 recites at least

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP,  
Garden West Office Park  
1500 Garden Road, Suite 220  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 655-0140  
Fax (831) 655-0288

Appl. No. 10/014,893  
 Amdt. dated October 13, 2006  
 Reply to Final Office Action of August 15, 2006

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

one key to provide access to a resource on said data communications network; a resource identifier, a resource server peer group ID; and a randomized user ID. The cited sections of Reiche and the cited sections of Rode failed to teach the foregoing recited elements, as previously discussed. A *prima facie* obviousness rejection has not been made. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Claims 1 to 6 remain in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571)273-8300, on October 13, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
 Attorney for Applicant(s)  
 Reg. No. 32,899

Rivkah Young  
 Rivkah Young

October 13, 2006  
 Date of Signature